

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,222	11/25/2003	Junji Hayashi	Q78668	4883
7590 05/03/2004 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3213			EXAMINER	
			GORDON, RAEANN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,, usining.on, D	20037 3213		3711	-
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/03/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/720,222	HAYASHI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Raeann Gorden	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period where the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 November 2003</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3,4 and 6 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce))☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1O-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-25-03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voorheis et al (2003/0229183) in view of Gendreau et al (4,955,613) and Nakamura (6,348,016). Regarding claim 1, Voorheis discloses a two-piece golf ball comprising a core made from a) 49% polybutadiene synthesized with a lanthanide series element (rare earth metals) having a cis-1,4 bond content of at least 80%, b) 0.05 to 18 phr organic peroxide, c) unsaturated carboxylic acid, d) sulfur based curing agents, and e) fillers. The core has a diameter from 1.4 to 1.6 inches (35,56-40,64 mm)(para.11). Voorheis discloses the core includes up to 49% of the lanthanide polybutadiene but does not disclose values from 60 to 100 as claimed by Applicant. However, Gendreau teaches a core comprising from 15 to 85 parts of a lanthanide polybutadiene. The cover is made from thermoplastic polyurethane or ionomers and has a thickness from 0.01 to 0.20 inches (0.254-5 mm) (para. 11, 43-44). The cover has a Shore D hardness of less than 60 (para. 46). Voorheis does not disclose a inorganic filler in the cover. However, Nakamura teaches a two-piece golf ball with a cover comprising an ionomer and from 11 to 45 parts of an inorganic filler (abstract).

Voorheis in view of Gendreau and Nakamura in combination teaches the deformation of the core and golf ball since the materials are the same. Regarding claim 2, Voorheis discloses the lanthanide metal is neodymium. Regarding claim 5, Nakamura discloses the inorganic filler is barium sulfate. Regarding claim 7, the weight of the golf ball in an obvious feature since nearly all golf balls have a required weight of no more than 1.62 ounces or 45.92 g. One skilled in the art would have modified Voorheis in view of Gendreau and Nakamura to achieve the golf ball properties.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, and 6 arre objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 703-308-8354. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 703-308-1513. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/720,222 Page 4

Art Unit: 3711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raeann Gorden

Examiner Art Unit 3711

Rg April 29, 2004